

**Merchant & Gould**

An Intellectual Property Law Firm

Georgia-Pacific Center  
133 Peachtree Street NE, Suite  
4900  
Atlanta, Georgia  
30303-1821  
TEL 404.954.5100  
FAX 404.954.5099  
www.merchant-gould.com

**Fax Transmission** | July 12, 2004

---

To:	Examiner Gerald Gauthier	From:	Alton Hornsby, Esq.
Company:	U.S. Patent and Trademark Office	Our Ref.:	
Your Ref:	App. No. 09/888,926	Fax No.:	404.954.5099
Fax No.:	(703) 746-7371	Phone No.:	404.954.5035
Phone No.:		Total Pages:	2
State/Country:	Georgia/USA	E-Mail:	ahornsby@merchant-gould.com
Confirmation Via Mail:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Return Fax To:	

---

**Document Transmitted**

Message:

*Redraw the femininity*

---

This transmission contains information that is confidential and/or legally privileged. It is intended for use only by the person to whom it is directed. If you have received this teletype in error, please notify us by telephone immediately so that we can arrange for the return of the original documents to us.

If you did NOT receive all of the pages, please call us in the U.S.A. at 404.954.5100 or fax us at 404.954.5099.

<b>TO:</b>	Examiner Gerald Gauthier (FAX No. 703-746-7371)
<b>FROM:</b>	Alton Hornsby
<b>DATE:</b>	July 12, 2004
<b>RE:</b>	Telephone Interview for Application 09/888,926(MG60027.0003US01)

### TELEPHONE INTERVIEW OUTLINE

Dear Examiner Gauthier:

Thank you for agreeing to discuss the above-identified case over a telephone interview scheduled for Tuesday, January 13, 2004 at 2 P.M. As noted during our previous conversation, this outline is an unofficial communication to summarize the issues I would like to discuss during that telephone interview. The purpose of my request for an interview is to discuss rejected independent claim 1 and the references used to reject those claims in an effort to identify allowable subject matter.

In the interview, I would like to discuss the following issues:

1. The rejection of independent claim 1:

In the Office Action of May 11, 2004, it is asserted that the Pelletier reference teaches the display of standard caller ID information (i.e., directory information; See Col. 9, lines 25-44). However, Applicant's understanding of Pelletier is that the reference teaches the display of non-standard caller ID information (i.e., information of interest such as weather, financial market data, time/temperature, sporting event results, etc.). Moreover, the Latter reference teaches away from a system including both audio and visual caller ID as the Latter reference specifically indicates that the audio information is only provided in the event standard caller ID is not available (i.e., blocked, unavailable or incomplete). Therefore, there is no motivation for someone using the invention of Latter to include a standard visual caller ID feature with the audio feature.

Sincerely,

Alton Hornsby, III